REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank	GENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank) 2. REPORT DATE 26 Dec 02 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Screening the Force: Modifying 1 6. AUTHOR(S) Thomas, J. L., Wright, K. M., Ne			FUNDING NUMBERS
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Commander Attn: Medical Research Unit CMR 442 APO AE 09042			PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U. S. Army Medical Research & Materiel Command Ft. Detrick, Frederick, MD 21702-5012			D. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		•.	
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY Approved for public release; dist		2003	30213 013
responsible health prevention/pre environments and, in terms of de stressors are consistently related. Thus, screening soldiers prior to deployment operations. Psychol soldier and for the overall mission about how to screen soldiers effet variables in determining the best military population? How does history of the US Army's psychol presentation of the current screen current screening instruments bat present results and implications. screening for all military personal	plogical monitoring of soldiers we comotion policy for the military reployment stress, researchers in to many adverse health outcome, during, and after deployments it on that could be adversely affected ascreening instruments? Is there one determine the efficacy of screening instruments? Is there one determine the efficacy of screening instruments used for deployated on sensitivity analyses and of In 1996, the Office of the Secretary and the efficacy of the Secretary analyses. The efficiency of the Secretary analyses and control of the Secretary analyses and control of the Secretary analyses. The efficiency of the Secretary analyses and the efficacy of the Secretary analyses and control of the Secretary analyses. The efficiency of the Secretary analyses and the efficiency of the Secretary analyses and the efficacy of the Secretary analyses and the efficiency of the efficiency of the Secretary analyses and the efficiency of th	medical community. Stresthe military community has (e.g., Orsillo, Roemer, less critical for identifying a terms of ensuring quality ed. There remain a few functional screening instrume a need to develop screen reening for the military? Ideliers deploying to the Bayed soldier mental health a contextual concerns. Final etary of Defense, Health Abree screening scales comg, 1965), the CAGE alcoh Vaitkus & Adler, 1994).	ave demonstrated that these Litz, Ehlich, & Friedman, 1998). t-risk soldiers across all phases of mental health care both for the indamental questions, however, ents? How important are contextual ing cut-off scores solely for a In this paper, we present a brief alkans. We follow this with a and propose modifications to the ly, we test these modifications and affairs mandated psychological monly used in clinical research of questionnaire (Ewing, 1984), and Two scales were added to the
Military deployment, Mental health screening, Soldiers, Clinical cut-offs, Screening instruments.			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLAS	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLAS	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICA OF ABSTRACT UNCLAS	ATION 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

UNCLAS

Screening the Force: Modifying psychological screening for deployed soldiers

Jeffrey L. Thomas, Kathleen M. Wright
and James W. Ness

US Army Medical Research Unit-Europe
Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, Department of Defense, Department of the Army, Army Medical Department, Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, or the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

For submission to the American Psychological Association Association's Convention, Chicago, IL, August, 2002

Screening the Force: Modifying psychological screening for deployed soldiers

Introduction

Few would argue that the psychological monitoring of soldiers who deploy (e.g., to Saudi Arabia, Kosovo, Uzbekistan) is a responsible health prevention/promotion policy for the military medical community. Stressors are inherent in deployed environments and, in terms of deployment stress, researchers in the military community have demonstrated that these stressors are consistently related to many adverse health outcomes (e.g., Orsillo, Roemer, Litz, Ehlich, & Friedman, 1998). Thus, screening soldiers prior to, during, and after deployments is critical for identifying at-risk soldiers across all phases of deployment operations.

Psychological screening is important in terms of ensuring quality mental health care both for the soldier and for the overall mission that could be adversely affected. There remain a few fundamental questions, however, about how to screen soldiers effectively. What is the best set of clinical screening instruments? How important are contextual variables in determining the best screening instruments? Is there a need to develop screening cut-off scores solely for a military population? How does one determine the efficacy of screening for the military?

In this paper, we present a brief history of the US Army's psychological screening program for soldiers deploying to the Balkans. We follow this with a presentation of the current screening instruments used for deployed soldier mental health and propose modifications to the current screening instruments based on sensitivity analyses and contextual concerns. Finally, we test these modifications and present results and implications.

In 1996, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Health Affairs mandated psychological screening for all military personnel redeploying from Bosnia. Three screening scales commonly used in clinical research were selected: the Zung Self-rating Depression Scale (SDS; Zung, 1965), the CAGE alcohol questionnaire (Ewing, 1984), and the Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Checklist (Bartone, Vaitkus & Adler, 1994). Two scales were added to the screening program in 2000: the Brief Symptoms Inventory (BSI)-Hostility Scale (Derogatis, 1993), and the Marital Satisfaction Index (Norton, 1993).

Hypotheses

The issue of whether these scales "screen" soldiers effectively is critical for military mental health assets and operational commanders. In this paper, the referral outcome process is used to test the efficacy of the screening program. Because of the burden placed on limited military mental health resources and on commanders whose deployment mission could be affected adversely if soldiers are misidentified, it is important to minimize false positives while balancing concern over false negatives and thus, reach an optimal threshold. We posited that

H1: there would be a reduction in false positive rates by raising the cut-offs on the SDS and BSI.

Additionally, social psychology suggests that the situational context can have a dramatic effect on individual appraisal of health and stress. Key to our study was to determine whether screening scales were appropriate for the context of the Kosovo peacekeeping deployment. We speculated that

H2: the CAGE alcohol questionnaire and PTSD scale may be unnecessary as well as insensitive as screening instruments.

As an organization, the US Army is traditional in nature and family-oriented. Over half of soldier and officers are married, and in the present sample approximately 49% of the deployed force were married. Therefore, as an exploratory question, we sought to determine the efficacy of the Marital Satisfaction Index for the subset of our deployed soldiers who were married. Previous military family research has shown that the military family can be under stress during deployment operations (e.g., Schumm, Bell, & Gade, 2000). We hypothesized that

H3: marital dissatisfaction may be a risk indicator worthy of inclusion in clinical screening for deployed soldiers.

Method

For the present study, we examined the screening scores on the Zung self-rating depression scale and the subsequent referral outcomes of 1,363 US Army soldiers three months following their 6-month deployment rotation in Kosovo. Demographically, 97% were male; 82% were between the ranks of private and sergeant, 15% between the ranks of staff sergeant and sergeant major, 3% officers; 45% were married; 54% were Caucasian, 24% African-American, 13% Hispanic, 4% Asian, and 5% Other.

Results and Discussion

Results supported or partially supported each of the three hypotheses and suggested modifications to the screening program for Balkan deployments. Specifically, we found that increasing the cut-off on the SDS reduced false positives by 10% without significantly reducing true positives rates. This result has implications in terms of

establishing a proper cut-off specifically for a military population. Furthermore, by increasing the cut-off of the BSI-Hostility scale, we reduced the false positive rate approximately 5 %. However, the true positive rate was also reduced, suggesting that adjustment of this scale should be cautiously considered.

We found support for the omission of the CAGE alcohol questionnaire and the PTSD checklist. The CAGE, in particular, had a high false positive rate (62 %).

Moreover, soldiers are prohibited from using alcohol during deployment. Including the CAGE warrants consideration at pre-deployment and post-deployment to determine negative coping and rebound effects from the deployment. However, we question the use of this particular index given the false positive rate. Soldiers had an extremely low base-rate exposure for the PTSD scale with around 1% identified through the scale as at-risk. Of the 1% identified, half of these soldiers were false positives. While the PTSD checklist is appropriate for acute situations, we question whether it's necessary in the current Kosovo peacekeeping mission. Research has shown that peacekeeping produces different types of stressors, with a substantial proportion identified as chronic in nature and not acute.

Finally, the Marital Satisfaction Index was a practical identifier of married soldiers at-risk. Roughly 10% of married soldiers exceeded our criteria for a positive screen. Of these married soldiers, only 11% were false positives, while 73% were either referred or identified with family problems. Since single soldiers may suffer from relationship or family problems as well, we propose augmenting this scale with items geared toward single soldier relationships.

The data presented above are part of an on going research surveillance mission.

Our hope is to continue to evolve our screening program to provide the most parsimonious set of predictors that are contextually relevant.

References

- Bartone, P. T., Vaitkus, M. A., and Adler, A. B. (1994). Measuring post-traumatic stress symptoms in soldiers. Paper presented at the USAREUR/7A Army AMEDD Symposium, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1993). <u>Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) administration, scoring, and procedures manual (3rd ed.).</u> Mineapolis: National Computer Systems.
- Ewing, J. A., (1984). Detection alcoholism: the CAGE questionnaire. <u>Journal of the</u>

 American Medical Association, 252, 1905-1907
- Norton, R. (1993). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable.

 Journal of Marriage and Family, February, 141-151.
- Orsillo, S.M., Roemer, L., Litz, B.T., Ehlich, P., & Friedman, M.J. (1998). Psychiatric symptomatology associated with contemporary peacekeeping: An examination of post-mission functioning among peacekeepers in Somalia. <u>Journal of Traumatic Stress, 11</u>, 611-625.
- Schumm, W.R., Bell, B.D., & Gade, P. A. (2000). Effects of military overseas peacekeeping deployment on marital quality, satisfaction, and stability.

 Psychological Reports, 87, 815-821.
- Zung, W.W.K. (1965). A self-rating depression scale. <u>Archives of General Psychiatry</u>, <u>12</u>, 63-70.